

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated May 1, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14, 16-21 and 23-24 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,189,788 issued to Sherman et al. ("Sherman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,149,947 issued to Collins, Jr. ("Collins, Jr.") and U.S. Patent No. 6,378,684 issued to Cox ("Cox"). Claims 4 and 13 were rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman as modified by Collins, Jr., and Cox as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/0143512 to Sturr, Jr. ("Sturr").

Claim 14 has been cancelled.

Independent Claim 1 includes, among other elements, language "wherein the mobile power supply is configured and arranged so as to output a voltage lying in a predetermined range for a standard AC voltage and wherein the computing device and peripherals thereof are configured so as to be powered by the standard AC voltage."

As stated by the Examiner, Sherman does not teach the above quoted element. However, the Examiner alleges that "[i]t would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the portable/mobile power supply having a capability of AC voltage/power converting as taught by Cox to the teaching of Sherman in view of Collins, Jr. in order to conveniently provide AC voltage/power to the system component, such as the controller 62 (column 8 lines 14-27)." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Sherman teaches a system that can be hand carried in a compartmentalized rectangular carrying case, where each rectangular component has its own direct current power supply. The compartmentalized rectangular carrying case is then disposed for example on a shopping cart to establish a flat surface as shown in Figure 9. There is no

reason why one of ordinary skill in art would add further components that would add considerable weight and disadvantages to the current Sherman design. Addition of Collins or Cox is not a predictable variation on the Sherman design but is a variation that would make the Sherman design unwieldy and cumbersome. This is clearly evidenced by the fact that the Cox system is not hand carried device but one that is designed to be pushed on a cart. Applicants respectfully state that Sherman, Collins, Jr., and Cox do not provide any reason for combining as alleged by Examiner nor show why Applicants' invention would be an alleged combination of the cited references.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 1.

Claims 2-4 and 16-17 depend on independent Claim 1 and include all of the elements of Claim 1. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, withdrawal of the rejections for Claims 2-4 and 16-17 is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 depends on and includes all of the elements of Claim 1. Moreover, Claim 5 states that the back plate receives the computing device and further that the backplate is tiltably mounted on the movable cart so that the user can position the computing device accordingly. Sherman does not show the above element as claimed. In fact, the language cited by the Examiner clearly indicates that the Sherman device is always meant to be kept flat or horizontal with respect to a seating position within the shopping cart as clearly shown in Figure 9. The grooves in Sherman are meant to keep the Sherman device in one position within the shopping cart. The user is meant to look down on the face of the Sherman device. The Sherman device cannot be tiltably operable or tiltably mounted within the shopping cart. For the reasons discussed above and with respect to Claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 6 includes, among other elements, language similar to that cited in Claims 1 and 5. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 5, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 7 includes, among other elements, language similar to that cited in Claims 1 and 5. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 5, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 7 is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-13 depend on independent Claim 7 and include all of the elements of Claim 7. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 7, withdrawal of the rejections for Claims 8-13 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 18 includes, among other elements, language similar to that cited in Claims 1 and 5. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 5, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 19 includes, among other elements, language similar to that cited in Claims 1 and 5. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 5, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 20 includes, among other elements, language similar to that cited in Claims 1 and 5. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 5, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 20 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 21 includes, among other elements, language similar to that cited in Claims 1 and 5. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 5, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 21 is respectfully requested.

Claims 23-24 depend on independent Claim 21 and include all of the elements of Claim 21. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 21, withdrawal of the rejections for Claims 23-24 is respectfully requested.

In Chen the computer coupling device retains control of both the desktop and the notebook in a configuration that allows each computer to share the system resources of the other computer. The notebook computer is not in control of the desktop data storage device. Sharing and access are not equivalent to control. The computer coupling device retains control. Chen does not show the element of control as claimed. Withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 45 is respectfully requested.

Claim 65 depends on independent Claim 64 and includes all of the elements of Claim 64. Moreover, Claim 64 states that the device (the data storage device) operates as if such device was dedicated to the host computer system in a first mode or to the second computer system in a second mode. Chen does not show the above element as claimed and in fact discusses sharing of resources with control by the computer coupling device. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 64 and 65, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 64 is respectfully requested.

Claim 66 depends on independent Claim 64 and includes all of the elements of Claim 64. Moreover, Claim 66 states that the internal control element transfers control. Chen does not show the above element as claimed and in fact shows the computer coupling device retaining control. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 64 and 66, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 66 is respectfully requested.

Claim 67 depends on independent Claim 64 and dependent Claim 66 and includes all of the elements of Claims 64 and 66. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 64 and 66, withdrawal of the rejection for Claim 67 is respectfully requested.

Correspondence and Fees

Please charge the fee of \$60.00 for a One Month Extension of Time to Deposit Account No. 03-3839. No additional fees are believed to be necessitated by the instant response. However, should this be in error, authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account no. 03-3839 for any underpayment, or to credit any overpayments.

Please address all correspondence to the correspondent address for **Customer No. 26345 of Intellectual Docket Administrator, Gibbons, P.C.**, One Riverfront Plaza, Newark, NJ 07102-5497. Telephone calls should be made to Abhik A. Huq at (215) 446-6268 and fax communications should be sent directly to him at 215-446-6309.

Respectfully submitted,



Abhik A. Huq
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 40,656

Gibbons P.C.
1700 Two Logan Square
18th and Arch Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103